

### REMARKS

This responds to 35.U.S.C.103a rejection of claims 1-3 5-6 8-11 14-15 18-19 over Hollenberg (US.6091956) and Walsh (US.6144848); claims 4 7 over Hollenberg, Walsh  
5 and Kennedy (US.6301480); claims 12 16 over Hollenberg, Walsh and Clare (US.5745036); and claims 13 17 over Hollenberg, Walsh and Forlenzo (US.6377821).

Firstly, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner substantively mis-applies the key reference Hollenberg to teach or suggest the essentially claimed limitation “object  
10 identifier representing one or more **goods in production, inventory and shipment.**”

In this regard, Examiner argues obviousness by citing Hollenberg specifically referring to fig. 4 showing advertising message service provider menu “Welcome to Redfield’s” 6h, sub-menu “apparel” 6i showing categories of merchandise included in offers, and environment proximate information retail store site “Redfield’s Dept. Store” 3e.

15 But in fact notwithstanding Examiner’s foregoing argument, there is no teaching or suggestion by Hollenberg (or any other cited reference) of Applicants’ claimed limitation of object identifier representing one or more **goods in production, inventory and shipment**, which is essential for Applicants’ processing of goods inventory  
20 management.

On the contrary against Examiner’s mis-applied argument, Hollenberg merely provides situational information (i.e., non-production/inventory/shipment information re

monitored goods) regarding services and time-critical information about places and events, including “travel distances and transit times, entertainment, merchants’ messages, area attractions, communications, current locations of system users, and traffic congestion information and user-generated information from bar-coded objects and digital photographs of scenes and other materials” (abstract).

Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner substantively mis-applies the key reference Hollenberg to teach or suggest the essentially claimed limitation including “a **first object location and a time** monitored at such location, **provided by a**  
10 **detector** coupled to the console processing unit; and a **second object location and a**  
**time** monitored at such location, **provided by a sensor** coupled to the processing unit.” In this regard, Examiner argues obviousness by citing Hollenberg specifically referring to fig. 1 showing transceivers 32a-c, fig. 6 showing rf antenna 14k, and fig. 9 showing digital copying camera 9m.

15 But in fact notwithstanding Examiner’s foregoing argument, there is no teaching or suggestion by Hollenberg (or any other cited reference) of Applicants’ claimed limitation of a **first object location and a time** monitored at such location, **provided by a detector ...**; and a **second object location and a time** monitored at such location,  
20 **provided by a sensor**, which is essential for Applicants’ monitoring of goods for inventory management.

On the contrary against Examiner's mis-applied argument, Hollenberg merely provides detector/transceiver monitoring (but without providing object location and time) such that "at an early point in a communication session the service provider may also respond to each user with GPS corrections specific to each satellite currently in use by the situation information system and the users such that the devices computer differentially corrected global positions" (col. 18, lines 51-56). Also Hollenberg merely provides sensor/camera monitoring (but without providing object location and time) such that "the digital camera, because of the decreasing size of its components, for example, the lens and the resulting tiny aperture, can serve to copy documents and can be fit into the handset" (col. 6, lines 19-22).

Thirdly, Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner substantively mis-applies the key reference Walsh to teach or suggest the essentially claimed limitation "that the **data structure is accessible for object-monitoring from only one or more specified network site or processor.**" In this regard, Examiner argues obviousness by citing Walsh specifically referring to definition of "'multimedia presentation' ... intended to mean that the host server may be accessed using the user device and method of the invention; that is may be instructed/commanded to supply telecommunication signals comprising an 'informational message' to the user device; and, that the signal received by the user device is capable of audio and/or visual presentation at the user device" (col. 14, lines 49-55).

But in fact notwithstanding Examiner's foregoing argument, there is no teaching or suggestion by Walsh (or any other cited reference) of Applicants' claimed limitation of **data structure ... accessible for object-monitoring from only one or more specified network site or processor**, which is essential for Applicants' processing of goods  
5 inventory management.

On the contrary against Examiner's mis-applied argument, Walsh merely provides general access (i.e., without limiting access from only specified site(s) or processor(s)) to order processing element 111 that "includes memory locations for inventory, user  
10 information, delivery schedules, accounting information and the like... representative examples of assigned memory locations in order processing element 111 may include e.g. user profiles such as account numbers, user device numbers and authentication codes and language preference .. other examples of assigned memory locations may include e.g. prior ordering history; inventories of goods or services that can be ordered; delivery  
15 schedules; and invoice, billing and collection histories" (col.19, line 61 to col. 20, line 4).

Respectfully submitted,



Dennis S. Fernandez  
Reg. No. 34,160

20

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Customer No: 22877

Address: Fernandez & Associates, LLP

25

PO Box D

Menlo Park, CA 94026-6204

Phone: (650) 325-4999

Fax: (650) 325-1203

Email: *iploft@iploft.com*